



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.          | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 09/933,892  | 08/21/2001  | Ismo Itkonen         | 100720-00050 (HEIN<br>18,938 | 6369             |
| 26304   | 7590        | 01/29/2004           | EXAMINER                     |                  |
| KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN<br>575 MADISON AVENUE<br>NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585 |             |                      | LOPEZ, MICHELLE              |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT                     | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 3721                         |                  |

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/933,892

Applicant(s)

ITKONEN ET AL.

Examiner

Michelle Lopez

Art Unit

3721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 20 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on November 21, 2003.
2. Claim 7 has been cancelled.
3. New claims 20 and 21 have been added.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hooper (US Pat. 5,533,321) in view of Lancaster (US Pat. 4,553,374). Hooper discloses the invention substantially as claimed including an apparatus for packaging paper rolls including a wrapper dispensing system with a wrapper dispensing station holding heavy wrapper rolls "WP" (see col. 1, lines 28-33), a wrapping dispensing means at the forward end of rolls "WP" (see Fig. 2). Hooper also discloses the process steps of supporting a roll of web material "W" on a roll rotation station via rollers "10", rotating the roll rotation station with the roll supported thereon (see col. 2; lines 66-67, and col. 3, line 1), the wrapper dispensing system remaining stationary relative to the rotating supported roll (see Fig. 2), dispensing a centered wrapping onto the rotating supported roll (see Fig. 1). Hooper'321 does not disclose the process step of moving the roll rotation station laterally in an axial direction relative to the wrapper dispensing system. However, Lancaster'374 teaches the process step of laterally moving a roll station "31, 32, 33" in

Art Unit: 3721

an axial direction relative to the wrapper dispensing system during the dispensing step for the purpose of wrapping the entire length of the roll in a slightly helical manner. In view of Lancaster'374, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art to have provided a process step of laterally moving a roll station in an axial direction relative to a wrapper dispensing system during the dispensing step in order to wrap the entire length of a roll in a slightly helical manner.

Regarding claims 3 and 21, it is deemed that layers of wound wrapping are aligned entirely overlapping to each other, therefore forming a staggered stepped bond.

Regarding claim 5, Hooper'321 does not disclose that the wrapping is aligned in a slightly helical position in regard to the roll rotation station. However, Lancaster'374 teaches a wrapping "56" aligned in a slightly helical position in regard to the roll station (see Fig. 10) for the purpose of wrapping the roll "36" with a helical configuration along the entire length of the roll being wrapped. In view of Lancaster'374, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art to have provided a wrapping aligned in a slightly helical position in regard to a roll station in order to wrap a roll with a helical configuration along the entire length of the roll being wrapped.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hooper'321 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pienta (US Pat. 6,347,498). Hooper'321 discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Hooper'321 does not disclose the process step of wrapping a plastic wrap onto the roll after the dispensing step, wherein the plastic wrap dispenser being incorporated into the wrapper dispensing system. However, Pienta'498 teaches the process step of wrapping a plastic wrap "116" onto the roll after the dispensing step, wherein the plastic

Art Unit: 3721

wrap dispenser is incorporated in the same wrapping station in conjunction with the web wrapper "42-48" for the purpose of providing a protective layer to the wrapped roll eliminating the process steps of handling the wrapped rolls from a first wrapping machine to a second wrapping machine and at the same time reducing the production cycle time (see col. 1; lines 11-25, and col. 5; lines 45-47). In view of Pienta'498, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided Hooper's invention including the process step of wrapping a plastic wrap performed in the same wrapping station in conjunction with the web wrapper in order to provide a protective plastic layer to a wrapped roll eliminating the process step of handling the wrapped rolls from a first wrapping machine to a second wrapping machine.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are deemed moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

8. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3721

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Lopez whose telephone number is 703-305-8205. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday: 8:00 am - 6:00 pm.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 703-308-2187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9302.

11. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

ML



Rinaldi I. Rada  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700